



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,025	04/08/2004	David Shippy	AUS920030973US1	9228

50170 7590 01/08/2007

IBM CORP. (WIP)

c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.

P.O. BOX 832745

RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER

LAI, VINCENT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/08/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/821,025	SHIPPY, DAVID	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vincent Lai	2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Vincent Lai. (3) Stephen Tkacs.
 (2) Fritz Fleming. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 December 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,7 and 16-21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sollars (U.S. Patent # 5,900,025).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 FRITZ FLEMING
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
 1/3/2007

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Interview Summary

An interview was conducted on 21 December 2006 over the telephone with Vincent Lai, Fritz Fleming, and Stephen Tkacs present.

Interview focused the final rejection and whether the reference, Sollars, covers the limitations as is.

No agreement could be reached as Examiner was unconvinced that discussed independent claims could overcome the reference on record.

*TWF
1/3/07* Examiner ~~could~~ did not agree with assertion of Attorney as Examiner believed the terms "correspond" and "associate" are broad enough that to establish any sort of relationship with what is being corresponded or associated is enough to cover the limitations of the claims. Applicant intends a much more specific relationship.

Please note that the original fax sent on 2006 December 14 will also be made of record in the application file per MPEP § 502.03.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent Lai whose telephone number is (571) 272-6749.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (First BiWeek Friday Off).

Art Unit: 2181

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fritz M. Fleming can be reached on (571) 272-4145. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vincent Lai
Examiner
Art Unit 2181

FL 3m - [Signature]
FRITZ FLEMING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
1/3/2007

vi
December 29, 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application: David Shippy	§	Group Art Unit: 2183
	§	
	§	
Serial No.: 10/821,025	§	Examiner: Lai, Vincent
	§	
Filed: April 8, 2004	§	Attorney Docket No.: AUS920030973US1
	§	
For: Architected Register File System	§	Customer No. 50170
Utilizes Status and Control Registers	§	
to Control Read/Write Operations		
Between Threads		

AGENDA FOR TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW
FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

Applicant's representative would like to schedule a telephonic interview for Tuesday, December 19, 2006, at 2:00 PM EST. Examiner is requested to call Applicant's representative to confirm or reschedule the telephone interview.

Please consider the following topics for discussion:

Sollars does not teach that each operand register file corresponds to a thread. Rather, *Sollars* teaches that the primary operand register file includes a number of registers for performing the function of storing instruction operands. More specifically, *Sollars* teaches that the primary operand register file is a scalable uni/multidimensional as wells as virtually/physically addressable register file, used for storing integer as well as floating point operands. However, *Sollars* does not teach that each register file corresponds to a thread.

Still further, *Sollars* does not teach or suggest a plurality of control bit sets that are configured to allow a thread associated with an associated status and control register to utilize other register files associated with other threads. The Office Action alleges that *Sollars* teaches this function at col. 15, lines 60-66, which states:

On an as needed basis, one of the threads of each context is temporarily conferred a context privilege, which further allows the context privileged thread to access and modify the thread's context level control register set 104 as well as the peer threads' control register sets 106.

The above portion teaches that threads may be allowed to access and modify a peer thread's **control** register sets. However, the Office Action alleges that the primary and secondary **operand** register files are equivalent to the plurality of register files of claim 1. Thus, the Office Action has not shown that *Sollars* teaches or fairly suggests a plurality of control bit sets that are configured to allow a thread to utilize other [operand] register files associated with other threads. In fact, *Sollars* does not even teach that each operand register file corresponds to a thread; therefore, *Sollars* cannot teach or suggest the feature of allowing one thread to utilize the register file of another thread, as recited in claim 1.

With respect to claims 6 and 9, *Sollars* does appear to teach a TCTL control register that includes flags for enabling various functions, such as locking a cache line, setting whether a store or load operation is cacheable, or setting whether a store or load operation is forced to complete in program order. However, the Office Action proffers no analysis as to why this is somehow equivalent to separately enabling a thread to read from a register file associated with a different thread or separately enabling a thread to write to a register file associated with a different thread.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number to confirm or reschedule the telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen R. Tkacs

Reg. No. 46,430

AGENT FOR APPLICANT

WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.

P.O. Box 832745

Richardson, TX 75083

(214) 722-6422